


REMARKS

Claim 42 has been amended for clarity. Claims 42 to 63 remain active in this application.

A requirement was made for election of species, however no indication was made in the Office action as to what the Examiner considers to be different species. The fact that all claims are not readable on a single figure is, per se, not a basis for a requirement of election of species. In the present case, it appears that there are two distinctly different sets of claims, namely (a) those that discuss the positioning of the electrostatic discharge device relative to the bond pad and the circuitry relative to the electrostatic discharge device and the I/O buffer which is found in claims 42 to 51 and (b) those that discuss positioning of the bond pad relative to the core region and the scribe region and the position of the I/O buffer relative to the scribe region, the core region and the bond pad which is found in claims 52 to 63. In view of the above listing of claims, applicant elects to prosecute the claims listed above as (a) which includes claims 42 to 51. Should the Examiner not be in agreement with this election, the Examiner is requested to indicate an alternative in writing for consideration.

Action and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Reg. No. 19906
(202) 639-7713